



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,279	01/29/2001	Toshihiro Shima	Q62411	6249

7590 09/03/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRC

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,279

Applicant(s)

SHIMA, TOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Umar Arshad

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Drawings

Figures 1, 2 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 81e. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "17" and "19" have both been used to designate a "display device". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "15" has been used to designate both a display device and display controller. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,426,761.

As per claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches an information display system comprising:

means for providing, on a screen of a computer, default sized display areas for a plurality of elements each having detailed information (see Kanevsky et al., figure 1(a), figure 5, and column 3, lines 58 - 63);

means for enlarging a corresponding, default sized display area when a user selects an element from said plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 11, lines 66 – 67 and column 12, lines 1 – 2);

means for displaying detailed information for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Kanevsky et al., column 12, lines 2 - 4); and

means for also displaying, on said screen, those elements that were not selected so that none of said elements are hidden under said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Kanevsky et al., column 5, lines 33 – 38, column 12, lines 16 – 19, and figure 5, item 610; It is inherent that the area that is zoomed in on the display does not block the rest of the screen in the fractal display of information).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 6, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 11, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for reducing sizes of said default sized display areas for said unselected elements and for summarizing contents displayed therein (see Kanevsky et al., figure 5, items 617 and 619, column 4, lines 31 – 57 and column 11, lines 59 - 65; the fractal representation of icons are reduced in size, the graphical display of the icon is thereby summarized when the icon size is reduced).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 7 is of similar scope to claim 2 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information

Art Unit: 2174

display system wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for adjusting sizes of display areas of said unselected elements to reflect a magnitude of relevancy of said unselected elements to said selected element (see Kanevsky et al., column 4, lines 24 – 30 and column 11, lines 55 – 58; the relevancy of a group of icons determines the spatial clustering of the fractal centralized around an icon).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 8 is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display system further comprising means for, when one of said plurality of elements is selected, adjusting arrangement on said display screen of said display areas for said plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 4, lines 46 – 67, column 5, lines 1 – 17, and column 12, lines 19 – 23; either the user can manually change the arrangement of the fractal clusters or the computer can dynamically change the arrangement of the fractal clusters).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 9 is of similar scope to claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kanevsky et al. further teaches the information display system wherein an element that is related to an objective or the needs of the user is included in said plurality of elements (see Kanevsky et al., column 10, lines 27 – 35; it is inherent that if an icon has been accessed before, it is useful to the user and is related to the needs of the user).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Kanevsky et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (see rejection above). Claim 10 is of similar scope to claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Clark et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,995,101 teaches a multi-level tool tip. Steele et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,973,694 teaches a method of communication using sized icons, text, and audio. Ishida, U.S. Patent No. 5,684,969 teaches an information

Art Unit: 2174

management system facilitating user access to information content through display of scaled information nodes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

UA